UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

DED	\sim	3 6				
DHIM	$\nu \iota$	1 1/1	ы	$\mathbf{H} \mathbf{N}$	11	H"/
PED]	•	· IVI	1 71	עול וו	1,	7/ /-

Plaintiff,

v.

No. 3:15-cv-1070(WIG)

CAROLYN COLVIN, Acting Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.	
	X

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT WITH REVERSAL AND REMAND [DOC. # 14]

Defendant, Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner of the Social Security

Administration, has moved this Court to enter judgment under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. §

405(g), with a reversal and remand of this cause to the Commissioner for further action. Counsel for Defendant represents that Plaintiff's counsel, Randi Mezzy, Esq., consents to the relief sought in the motion.

Under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), the Court has the power to enter a judgment with a reversal and remand of the cause to the Commissioner for further proceedings. *See Shalala v. Schaefer*, 509 U.S. 292, 297 (1993); *Melkonyan v. Sullivan*, 501 U.S. 89, 98 (1991). Remand for further development of the record is appropriate when gaps exist in the administrative record or when the administrative law judge ("ALJ") committed legal error. *See Parker v. Harris*, 626 F.2d 225, 235 (2d Cir. 1980).

Here, the Commissioner has determined that further development of the record and additional administrative action is warranted. Upon remand, Plaintiff will be given an opportunity for a new hearing and to submit additional evidence in accordance with 20 C.F.R. §§ 405.331 and

405.350. Further, the ALJ will obtain vocational expert testimony, present a hypothetical to the vocational expert that includes all of the limitations in the ALJ's residual functional capacity finding, and apply the medical improvement standard. The ALJ will then issue a new decision.

Accordingly, Defendant's Motion for Entry of Judgment under Sentence Four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) with Reversal and Remand of the Cause to the Defendant [Doc. # 14] is granted.

This is not a Recommended Ruling. The parties have consented to the Magistrate Judge's entering a final order in this case without the need for entry of a recommended ruling and review by a District Judge. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 73(b). The Clerk is directed to enter a separate judgment in favor of Plaintiff in this matter under Rule 58(a), Fed. R. Civ. P., to remand this cause to the Commissioner for further administrative proceedings in accordance with this Order, and to close this case.

It is SO ORDERED, this 1st day of December, 2015, at Bridgeport, Connecticut.

/s/ William I. Garfinkel
WILLIAM I. GARFINKEL
United States Magistrate Judge